

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

CHARLIE REYES,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 2:24-cv-831-KG-KRS

**LINCOLN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS;
BRYCE BAILEY; TODD DANLEY;
PRESTON RODELLA; GERALDINE MARTINEZ;
LINCOLN COUNTY MANAGER [NAME];**

Defendants.

INITIAL SCHEDULING ORDER

This case is before the Court for scheduling, case management, discovery, and other non-dispositive matters. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as amended, as well as the Local Rules of the Court, will apply to this lawsuit.

The pro se plaintiff and defendant, appearing through counsel, shall endeavor to “meet and confer” no later than **July 7, 2025** to formulate a provisional discovery plan. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f). **As part of this process, the parties are reminded that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f) requires them to exchange views on the “disclosure, discovery, or preservation of electronically stored information, including the form or forms in which it should be produced.” The parties have an attendant duty to preserve all electronically stored information that may be discoverable in this case.**

The time allowed for discovery is generally 120 to 180 days. Following their “meet and confer,” the parties shall endeavor to cooperate to prepare a *Joint Status Report and Provisional Discovery Plan* (“JSR”), or, at either party’s election with notice to the other side, shall each file a *Separate Status Report and Provisional Discovery Plan*. The *Joint* or *Separate Status Report(s)*

and Provisional Discovery Plan(s) should follow the sample available on the Court's website.¹

The blanks for suggested/proposed dates in the Report are to be filled in by the parties. Actual dates will be promulgated by order of the Court to be entered after the Rule 16 scheduling conference scheduled pursuant to this order. If a Joint Report is prepared, the represented party is responsible for filing the JSR. If Separate Reports are prepared, each side is responsible for filing his or her own Separate Report. The Joint or Separate Reports should be filed by **July 14, 2025**.

Initial disclosures by a party pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1) shall be made within fourteen (14) days after the meet-and-confer session.

A telephonic Rule 16 scheduling conference will be conducted on **July 23, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.** (Mountain Time). Counsel and any *pro se* party shall call Judge Sweazea's WebEx Teleconference line at **(855) 244-8681** and enter Meeting Number **2300 989 9447#** to be connected to the proceedings. Parties represented by counsel may, but are not required to, attend the telephonic scheduling conference. At the Rule 16 scheduling conference, counsel and *pro se* parties should be prepared to discuss discovery needs and scheduling, all claims and defenses, the use of scientific evidence, whether a *Daubert*² hearing is necessary, initial disclosures, the time of expert disclosures and reports under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2), and sequencing of fact and expert discovery. The Court, counsel, and *pro se* parties will also discuss settlement prospects and alternative dispute resolution possibilities. In addition, the scheduling conference

¹ Pursuant to Administrative Order No. 06-173, the JSR replaces and supersedes the Provisional Discovery Plan and the Initial Pretrial Report, effective January 2, 2007. The standardized *Joint Status Report and Provisional Discovery Plan* is available at www.nmd.uscourts.gov/forms from the drop-down menu.

² *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993).

participants will address consideration of consent by the parties to a United States Magistrate Judge presiding over dispositive proceedings, including motions and trial, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

If service on all parties is not complete, Plaintiffs, whether appearing through counsel or *pro se*, are responsible for notifying all parties of the contents of this order.

Good cause must be shown, and the express written approval obtained from the Court, for any modifications of the dates in the scheduling order that issues from the JSR.

Pretrial practice in this case shall be in accordance with the above.

Special Notice to Pro Se Litigants:

Generally, *pro se* litigants are held to the same standards of professional responsibility as trained attorneys. It is a *pro se* litigant's responsibility to become familiar with and to comply with the *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure* and the *Local Rules of the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico* (the "Local Rules").

Guide for Pro Se Litigants at 4, United States District Court, District of New Mexico (October 2022). The Local Rules, the Guide for Pro Se Litigants and a link to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are available on the Court's website: <http://www.nmd.uscourts.gov>.

Compliance with Rule 11

The Court reminds Plaintiff, as a *pro se* litigant, of his obligations pursuant to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Yang v. Archuleta*, 525 F.3d 925, 927 n. 1 (10th Cir. 2008) ("*Pro se* status does not excuse the obligation of any litigant to comply with the fundamental requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil and Appellate Procedure."). Rule 11(b) provides:

Representations to the Court. By presenting to the court a pleading, written motion, or other paper--whether by signing, filing, submitting, or later advocating it--an attorney or unrepresented party certifies that to the best of the person's knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances:

(1) it is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation;

(2) the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law or for establishing new law;

(3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and

(4) the denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence or, if specifically so identified, are reasonably based on belief or a lack of information.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b). Failure to comply with the requirements of Rule 11 may subject Plaintiff to sanctions, including monetary penalties and nonmonetary directives. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c).

Obligation to Prosecute and Service Requirement

The Court reminds Plaintiff that he has an obligation to prosecute his case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) (“If the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order, a defendant may move to dismiss the action”); *Gustafson v. Luke*, 696 Fed. Appx. 352, 354 (10th Cir. 2017) (“Although the language of Rule 41(b) requires that the defendant file a motion to dismiss, the Rule has long been interpreted to permit courts to dismiss actions *sua sponte* for a plaintiff’s failure to prosecute or comply with the rules of civil procedure or court’s orders.”) (quoting *Olsen v. Mapes*, 333 F.3d 1199, 1204 n.3 (10th Cir. 2003)). The Court also reminds Plaintiff of his obligation to serve all named defendants. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(1) (“The plaintiff is responsible for having the summons and complaint served within the time allowed by Rule 4(m) and must furnish the necessary copies to the person who makes service”).

IT IS SO ORDERED this 2nd day of June, 2025.



KEVIN R. SWEAZE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE